

REFERENCES

- [1] Kenneth J Arrow, Amartya Sen, and Kotaro Suzumura. *Handbook of Social Choice & Welfare*, volume 2. Elsevier, 2010.
- [2] A. Gibbard. Manipulation of Voting Schemes: a General Result. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 587–601, 1973.
- [3] M.A. Satterthwaite. Strategy-proofness and Arrow’s Conditions: Existence and Correspondence Theorems for Voting Procedures and Social Welfare Functions. *Journal of Economic Theory (JET)*, 10(2):187–217, 1975.
- [4] John J. Bartholdi III, Craig A. Tovey, and Michael A. Trick. The computational difficulty of manipulating an election. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 6(3):227–241, 1989.
- [5] Piotr Faliszewski and Ariel D. Procaccia. AI’s war on manipulation: Are we winning? *AI MAGAZINE*, 31(4):53–64, 2010.
- [6] Nir Ailon. Aggregation of partial rankings, p-ratings and top-m lists. *Algorithmica*, 57(2):284–300, 2010.
- [7] Alexander Reffgen. Generalizing the Gibbard–Satterthwaite theorem: partial preferences, the degree of manipulation, and multi-valuedness. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 37(1):39–59, 2011.
- [8] Maria Silvia Pini, Francesca Rossi, Kristen Brent Venable, and Toby Walsh. Aggregating Partially Ordered Preferences. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 19(3):475–502, June 2009.
- [9] Edith Elkind and Nisarg Shah. Electing the Most Probable Without Eliminating the Irrational: Voting Over Intransitive Domains. In Nevin L. Zhang and Jin Tian, editors, *UAI*, pages 182–191. AUAI Press, 2014.
- [10] Nir Ailon. An Active Learning Algorithm for Ranking from Pairwise Preferences with an Almost Optimal Query Complexity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):137–164, January 2012.
- [11] Xiaoye Jiang, Lek-Heng Lim, Yuan Yao, and Yinyu Ye. Statistical ranking and combinatorial Hodge theory. *Mathematical Programming*, 127(1):203–244, March 2011.
- [12] Sahand Negahban, Sewoong Oh, and Devavrat Shah. Iterative ranking from pair-wise comparisons. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2474–2482, 2012.
- [13] Xi Chen, Paul N Bennett, Kevyn Collins-Thompson, and Eric Horvitz. Pairwise ranking aggregation in a crowdsourced setting. In *Proceedings of the sixth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 193–202. ACM, 2013.
- [14] Arun Rajkumar and Shivani Agarwal. A statistical convergence perspective of algorithms for rank aggregation from pairwise data. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 118–126, 2014.
- [15] John J Bartholdi III and James B Orlin. Single transferable vote resists strategic voting. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 8(4):341–354, 1991.
- [16] Lirong Xia, Michael Zuckerman, Ariel D Procaccia, Vincent Conitzer, and Jeffrey S Rosenschein. Complexity of Unweighted Coalitional Manipulation under Some Common Voting Rules. In *IJCAI*, volume 9, pages 348–352. Citeseer, 2009.
- [17] Jessica Davies, Nina Narodytska, and Toby Walsh. Eliminating the Weakest Link: Making Manipulation Intractable? In *Proceedings of the 26th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1333–1339. AAAI Press, 2012.
- [18] Jessica Davies, George Katsirelos, Nina Narodytska, Toby Walsh, and Lirong Xia. Complexity of and algorithms for the manipulation of Borda, Nanson’s and Baldwin’s voting rules. *Artificial Intelligence*, 217:20–42, 2014.
- [19] Piotr Faliszewski, Edith Hemaspaandra, and Henning Schnoor. Copeland voting: Ties matter. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems-Volume 2*, pages 983–990. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2008.
- [20] Benjamin L Schwartz. Possible winners in partially completed tournaments. *SIAM Review*, 8(3):302–308, 1966.
- [21] Walter Kern and Daniël Paulusma. The Computational Complexity of the Elimination Problem in Generalized Sports Competitions. *Discrete Optimization*, 1(2):205–214, November 2004.
- [22] Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman & Co., New York, NY, USA, 1979.
- [23] Miroslav Chlebík and Janka Chlebíková. Approximation Hardness for Small Occurrence Instances of NP-hard Problems. In *Algorithms and Complexity*, pages 152–164. Springer, 2003.
- [24] Arunava Sen. Another direct proof of the Gibbard–Satterthwaite theorem. *Economics Letters*, 70(3):381–385, 2001.
- [25] Navin Aswal, Shurojit Chatterji, and Arunava Sen. Dictatorial domains. *Economic Theory*, 22(1):45–62, 2003.
- [26] Shin Sato. Circular domains. *Review of Economic Design*, 14(3-4):331–342, 2010.
- [27] Anup Pramanik. Further results on dictatorial domains. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 45(2):379–398, 2015.
- [28] John Duggan and Thomas Schwartz. Strategic manipulability without resoluteness or shared beliefs: Gibbard-Satterthwaite generalized. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 17(1):85–93, 2000.
- [29] Piotr Faliszewski, Edith Hemaspaandra, and Henning Schnoor. Manipulation of Copeland Elections. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems: volume 1-Volume 1*, pages 367–374. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2010.
- [30] Piotr Faliszewski, Edith Hemaspaandra, Lane A Hemaspaandra, and Jörg Rothe. Llull and Copeland voting computationally resist bribery and constructive control. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, pages 275–341, 2009.
- [31] Nina Narodytska and Toby Walsh. The Computational Impact of Partial Votes on Strategic Voting. In

- Proceedings of the 21st European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)*, pages 657–662, 2014.
- [32] Zack Fitzsimmons and Edith Hemaspaandra. Complexity of Manipulative Actions When Voting with Ties. In *Algorithmic Decision Theory*, pages 103–119. Springer, 2015.
- [33] Vijay Menon and Kate Larson. Complexity of Manipulation in Elections with Top-truncated Ballots. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.05900*, 2015.
- [34] Vijay Menon and Kate Larson. Reinstating Combinatorial Protections for Manipulation and Bribery in Single-Peaked and Nearly Single-Peaked Electorates. In *AAAI*, 2016.
- [35] Kathrin Konczak and Jérôme Lang. Voting procedures with incomplete preferences. In *Proc. IJCAI-05 Multidisciplinary Workshop on Advances in Preference Handling*, volume 20, 2005.
- [36] Toby Walsh. Uncertainty in Preference Elicitation and Aggregation. In *AAAI*, volume 7, pages 3–8, 2007.
- [37] Nadja Betzler and Britta Dorn. Towards a dichotomy for the possible winner problem in elections based on scoring rules. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 76(8):812–836, 2010.
- [38] M. S. Pini, F. Rossi, K. B. Venable, and T. Walsh. Incompleteness and incomparability in preference aggregation: Complexity results. *Artificial Intelligence*, 175(7–8):1272–1289, May 2011.
- [39] Dorothea Baumeister and Jörg Rothe. Taking the final step to a full dichotomy of the possible winner problem in pure scoring rules. *Information Processing Letters*, 112(5):186–190, February 2012.
- [40] Serge Gaspers, Victor Naroditskiy, Nina Narodytska, and Toby Walsh. Possible and Necessary Winner Problem in Social Polls. In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-agent Systems*, pages 613–620. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2014.
- [41] Lirong Xia and Vincent Conitzer. Determining Possible and Necessary Winners under Common Voting Rules Given Partial Orders. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, pages 25–67, 2011.
- [42] Sergey Brin and Lawrence Page. Reprint of: The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual web search engine. *Computer networks*, 56(18):3825–3833, 2012.
- [43] David C Parkes and Lirong Xia. A complexity-of-strategic-behavior comparison between Schulze’s rule and ranked pairs. In *Proceedings of the 26th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI’12)*. American Association for Artificial Intelligence, 2012.